semble good German. The immigrants from the Empire have considerable difficulty in understanding it. Furthermore, French words, more or less corrupted, are numerous in it, and this language of the people furnishes, to any one who will take pains to study it, a faithful reflection of the changing destinies of Alsace which has taken something from each of its successive possessors.

"All those who have actually seen the real condition of the annexed provinces can not fail, we think, to agree with us on these points. Hence, they will be compelled to recognize that the solution advanced by the anonymous Prussian author of the article cited, animated though he be, as we are happy to recognize, by the best and most praiseworthy intentions, is fundamentally wrong. And we think that, in spite of his effort to be impartial, for which he ought to have due credit, he is astray in saying to Emperor William: 'You can convert the German-speaking inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine from adversaries into fervent German patriots.' The reason is, we repeat, that if they speak German, it is against their will, because they are forced to do it, and because they consider it always a foreign language imposed by law. Their mother tongue is, according to their class, either French or the local patois.

"Furthermore, as was recognized by the Chicago Peace Congress and as the living example of Switzerland proves, it is not alone on the basis of language that the nationality of populations rests, and especially in the case under consideration it is not on that ground that a definite solution can be found. Regard must be had to the sentiments which have uniformly been expressed by the annexed people themselves, and to the right which all peoples have of freely disposing of themselves.

"The plebiscitum, the personal vote of the native inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine is the only practicable, the only possible solution, and since this would in the nature of the case bring about a general peace, we may add that it alone is in harmony with the maxim which is always true: 'If you wish peace, establish liberty and justice.'"

A NATIONAL BOARD OF CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION.

Two important bills have been brought forward in the present Congress for the creation of a National Board of Arbitration. One of these was prepared by Hon. Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, the other by Attorney-General Olney. The former bill was introduced on December 18th, the latter on January 17th. The former provides for the creation of a Commission to be known as the United States Board of Conciliation and Arbitration, composed of five Commissioners, appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, not more than three of whom shall be chosen from the same political party, and no one of whom shall hold any pecuniary relation whatever to any common carrier or employer.

The other bill provides that in case of any serious controversy between a common carrier and the employees of such carrier the Chairman of the Inter-State Commerce Commission and the Commissioner of Labor, acting as a board of mediation and conciliation, shall make an effort with all practicable expedition to settle such controversy. If this effort shall fail, the bill provides that they shall then endeavor to have the controversy submitted to the arbitration of a board of three persons, of whom the Chairman of the Inter-State Commerce Commission shall be one, and the other two of whom shall be chosen, one by the carrier or employer directly interested, the other by the labor organization or organizations, to which the employees directly interested belong.

The first bill gives the Commission of five authority to inquire into the terms and conditions of employment of all employees subject to the provisions of the bill, to summon witnesses and procure all available documentary evidence, and to invoke the aid of the United States courts if necessary. It provides that in case of a strike, lockout, or boycott, actually declared or threatened, between those subject to the provisions of the act, the Commission shall try at once to bring about an amicable settlement by mediation and conciliation. It is also authorized to investigate any complaint made to it by any employee or corporation or association of employees, or forwarded to it by any commissioner of labor, or board of conciliation and arbitration in any State or Territory, and to make a report in writing of such investigation, which shall afterwards be prima facie evidence in case of judicial proceedings. If mediation and conciliation fail, all differences and controversies investigated may then be submitted in writing to the Commission for arbitration, the decision to be final and conclusive, any Circuit Court of the United States being given power to enforce the same. In case either party to the arbitration is dissatisfied with the decision, the said party may apply to any Circuit Court of the United States, which shall sit as a Court of Equity and determine the case in such way as to do justice in the premises. During the pendency of the arbitration, employees may not be discharged except for inefficiency, nor may they engage in or aid strikes and boycotts against their employers. Employees of railroads which are in the hands of receivers appointed by Federal Courts may be heard through representatives of their associations in such courts as to the terms and conditions of their employment. Employers may not discriminate against any employee because of his membership in any labor organization.

The further provisions of the second bill are much the same as these of the first, except that an appeal to a Circuit Court of the United States may be made only for matter of law apparent on the record. In this bill the writing which submits a case for arbitration must be acknowledged by the parties before a notary public, and there can be no second arbitration on the same matter until two years have passed. Both bills provide that the articles of incorporation of any organization must make it a disownable offence for any member to participate in

or instigate force or violence against person or property during strikes, lockouts or boycotts. Mr. Olney's bill provides also that in case a controversy shall become so serious as to inflict great injury upon the general public by interfering with interstate traffic, and at the same time shall be incapable of being settled by mediation or arbitration, the Attorney-General of the United States shall have power to file in any Circuit Court of the United States a bill to prevent such public mischiefs.

These bills, which are now in the hands of the Committee on Labor, are both good ones. Neither of them attempts the impossible task of bringing about compulsory arbitration. Mr. Olney's bill might well have omitted the last provision referred to, which seems hardly in place in a measure creating a Board of Arbitration. His bill is, on the whole, somewhat simpler than the other, and the carrying out of its provisions would be much less expensive, but Mr. Wright's bill, by creating a Commission entirely independent of the Inter-State Commerce Commission and the Labor Bureau, would be more likely to secure impartial results and thus to be more effective and to give more general satisfaction.

Such a board would not and could not be expected to solve all the difficulties arising between the common carriers of the country and their employees, but it would go a long way toward doing this, and no project of legislation is now before Congress which deserves more serious consideration by our national lawmakers than this.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The decision has at last been rendered by the judges appointed to examine the essays handed in last July in competition for the three prizes offered by the American Peace Society to seniors and juniors in the colleges and universities of the United States for the three best essays, of not more than 3500 words in length, on the "Economic Waste of War." The first prize of $100 goes to Mr. Henry Salant of the University of the city of New York, the second of $50 to Mr. B. F. Arnold of Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa, and the third of $25 to Mr. Arthur K. Kuhn, last year of the College of the city of New York, this year of Columbia.

The judges found the essays nearly all well written and of such uniformity in value that a decision was hard to reach. Some of the rejected essays are even more valuable in subject matter than the successful ones, but their style was so inferior in the judgment of the examiners that the preference had to be given to others. Other judges might, and very probably would, have rendered a different decision as to some of the better essays. We congratulate all the young men on the excellence of their work, and wish we had sufficient funds to send them each a handsome check.

We print this month the essays which were adjudged worthy of the first and second prizes. On the first vote of the judges each of these essays received one vote for first place. Some of the other essays we shall publish later.

On the 14th of January Senator Sherman introduced another bill into the Senate for the promotion of arbitration between this and other countries. It is intended to enable the President to carry into execution the resolution of Congress of April 4, 1890, which requested him "to invite, from time to time, as fit occasion may arise, negotiations with any government with which the United States may have diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences or disputes arising between the governments which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agency may be referred to arbitration."

The present resolution authorizes him to conduct such negotiations through the regular diplomatic agents of the United States, or at his discretion to appoint a commission to visit such other governments as he may determine, for the purpose of instituting negotiations with them for the creation of a tribunal of international arbitration, or other appropriate means, whereby difficulties and disputes between nations may be peaceably settled and wars prevented.

This bill is in part like one which Mr. Sherman introduced last year, with which nothing has ever been done. But it embodies the further idea, which is Mr. Sherman's own, that the negotiations for arbitration treaties and for a permanent tribunal should be conducted through the regular diplomatic channels. If this resolution should pass it would give the Chief Executive standing authority to proceed at any suitable time to open arbitration negotiations of any kind with any government with which we have diplomatic relations. The plan is a most excellent one, perhaps the most direct and expeditious that could be devised, and we do not see why the Committee on Foreign Affairs should not report it favorably without much delay.

Commenting on Senator Sherman's bill as above outlined the Boston *Herald* says:

"Senator Sherman's bill to provide for a tribunal of international arbitration, whereby disputes between nations may be peaceably settled and war averted, will probably not be permitted to take precedence of the appropriation bills for more armored cruisers. There is nothing like powerful ships of war to maintain peace and concord between the nations of the earth."

It is unfortunately too true that army and navy appropriation bills have begun to take precedence of practically everything else in Congress. The naval committee is likely to report favorably the Secretary of the Navy's recommendation for the building of three new war ships at a cost of four millions each and a dozen torpedo boats, and the probability is that Congress will vote without much hesitation an appropriation to meet the expense.